

In conclusion, just some general reflections on the reasons for the relative indifference to the passing away of Sasanian rule will be presented. The contract, the concordat if one will, between the episcopate of the church of the East and the Persian imperial authority, impressively illustrated in the synodal acts of the fifth and sixth centuries, was not followed by the appearance of a Persian Constantine, who would have converted the Sasanian empire to Christianity. Khosrau II, despite his several Christian wives and favorites and his personal dabbling in at least peripheral aspects of Christian religiosity, did not continue the former policy of state support of the Nestorian church, but favored the monophysites and in the end may even have begun to turn against Christians in general. The toleration practiced by Khosrau's weak successors, in part motivated by political difficulties, did not restore the concordat. At the time of the Arab conquest the Christian leaders no longer felt, it seems, that the church was bound to the Sasanian imperial system. Impressed by the ease and rapidity of the Arab conquest, which they naturally interpreted, in theological terms, as signs of divine approbation, they made their submission to the new order, which initially at least was characterized by a large degree of *laissez-faire*. There was a — to us curiously myopic — lack of comprehension of Islam as a new aggressive spiritual movement. Despite the noteworthy beginning of large-scale missionary enterprise around this time, the Nestorian church did not take advantage of the spell of relative freedom in the seventh and early eighth centuries to consolidate its previous gains. Rather one can see the appearance of a certain communal exhaustion after intense internal jurisdictional and confessional struggles in late Sasanian times. The way was being prepared for the imposition and supine acceptance of inferior, marginal *dhimmī*-status in the Abbasid period. If, after the initial euphoria, the Christians did come to realize that it made a great deal of difference, in the long run, which master they served, by then they had really no choice at all in the matter.

Ilya GERSHEVITCH

Université de Cambridge

LITERACY IN TRANSITION FROM THE ANSHANIAN TO THE ACHAEMENIAN PERIOD

A. TEXT OF THE HANDOUT

LITERACY IN ANSHANO-PERSIAN TRANS-ITION

Old Persian column

Elamite column

1. NIDINTU-BEL (DB §§ 16-20)

- 1a. Revolted in Babylon.
 1b. *adam B-rum ašyavam* *û Bapili pariya*
abi avam N-B-ram *Nutitbel hupiri ikka*
 «I went off to Babylon against that N-B»
 1c. Darius overcomes N-B's attempt to prevent his crossing the Tigris.
 1d. *adam B-rum ašyavam* *û Bapili pariya*
 «I went off to Babylon»
 1e. *B-ru[m] nai ulpāyam* *Bapili inni lipuketa*
 (as yet) «at Babylon I had not arrived»
 Wei.: «an Babylon war ich noch nicht heran»
 Bth.: «bevor ich nach Babylon gelangt war»
 1f. *N-B āiš patiš mām* *N-B šinnuk û irrutaš*
 «N-B came against me»; Wei.: «N-B zog mir entgegen»
 1g. N-B offers battle by they Euphrates and is defeated.
 1h. *N-B am[uša Bā]-rum ašyava* *N-B puttuka sak Bapili lipka*
 «N-B fled, he went off to Babylon»; Wei.: «floh, zog nach B.»
 1i. *adam B-rum ašyavam* *û Bapili mituketa*
 «I went to Babylon»
 1j. «By the favor of Ahuramazda both I seized Babylon and I took that N-B prisoner. After that, I slew that N-B in Babylon».

2. FRAVARTI (§§ 24-25, 31-32)

- 2a. Proclaimed himself king of Media. The Median
kāra abi avam F-tim ašyava *taššup hupiri ikki pariš*
 «army went over to that F.» army that (one) to «ašyava»
 2b. Darius, in Babylon, instructs Vidarna and the latter's troops:
para-i-ta (root i-, 2nd pl. ipt.) *miteš*
 «Go forth! (Smite the rebel Median army!)»
 2c. *Vidarna ašyava* *Mitarna Madape ikki sak*
 «Vidarna marched off» Vidarna Media to «ašyava»

- 2d. *yaθā Mādam parārasa* *sap Madape ikki ir parik*
 «When he arrived in Media» when Media to/in (he) «parārasa»
 2e. he inflicted on the rebels a preliminary defeat. Thereafter he
 2f. *amāniya yaθā* *zatiš kuš*
adam arasam Mādam *ū šinnuket Madape ikki*
 «waited until I arrived in Media».
 2g. Meanwhile I, Darius, gained control of Babylon, departed from the city, and
 2h. *ašyavam Mādam* «arrived in Media» *Madape ikki pariya*
 2i. *yaθā Mādam parārasam* *sap Madape ikki in paruket*
 «When I arrived in Media»
 2j. *F-tiš āiš patiš mām* *F-tiš šinnuk* (with *patiš mām* ignored)
 «Fravartiš came against me (to join battle)»
 2k. Defeated in battle, Fravarti
*amuθa *Ragām ašyava* *puttuka Rakkan sak*
 «fled, went off to Ragā», Wei.: «floh, zog nach R».

3. THE ANONYMOUS CHIEFTAIN (§47)

- 3a. Defeated in battle by the satrap Vivana, the chieftain
amuθa ašyava *puttuka sak*
 «fled, got away», Wei.: «floh, zog fort»
 3b. *Aršādā nāmā didā* *halmarriš Iršada hiše*
avaparā atiyāiš *hami lipka*
 «a fortress by name Aršādā, past that he went».
 Bth.: «eine Festung, A. mit Namen, vor der zog er dort vorüber».
 Wei.: «eine Burg namens A., nach dieser zog er hin».
 3c. *Vivāna .. ašyava* *Mimana .. sak*
 «Vivana went off (in pursuit of him)».
 3d. «there he took him prisoner, slew (him)».
 3e. Der von Vivāna geschlagene Führer .. musste vor der mit treuen Truppen
 belegten Festung Aršādā vorbei, die auf seiner Rückzugslinie lag. Dort wurde er
 festgehalten und dann von dem nachsetzenden Vivāna gefangengenommen.

4. PARALEIPOMENA

- 4a. DPh: **Sakā tayai para Sugdam* *Sakkape akkape Sukta mituma*
 «The Sacas beyond Sogdiane» «The Sacas mit-ing Sogdiane»
 4b. DNa: *Sakā tayai para-draya* *Sakka appa KAM mitumana*
 «The Sacas beyond the Sea» «The Sacas mit-ing the Sea»
 4c. *para-i-tā patiš NN* *NN irma šinnup* (DB passim)
 «(the rebels assembled,) came out against NN (to join battle)»
 4d. *Pārsahya martiyahya dūrai arštiš* *ruh-irra Paršira.na šadanika sirum hi*
parāgmatā *parik* (DNa)
 «far did the Persian man's spear arrive/reach»

5. SUPPLETIVE COALITION

- 5a. *parā-rasa-: parā-gmata-* «arrive/reach»
 5b. *ā-i-: ā-gmata-* «come»
 5c. *para-i-: *para-gmata-* «vorausgehen»
 5d. *rasa-: para-ita-* «arrive» (cf. «vorkommen»)

6. ALPHABETICALLY ORDERED CORRELATION

<i>ati-i-: lip-</i> , 3b		<i>ati-i-</i>
<i>ā-i- + patiš: šinnu-</i> , 1f2j	<i>lip-</i> eintreffen	<i>šyav-</i>
<i>para-i-/*para-gmata-: mit-</i> , 2b		<i>upa-i-</i>
<i>parā-rasa-/parā-gmata-: pari-</i> Conj. II,	<i>mit-</i> go ahead	<i>para-i-/*para-gmata-</i>
2di4d		<i>šyav-</i>
<i>rasa-/para-ita-: šinnu-</i> , 2f4c	<i>pari-</i> Co. I make for: <i>šyav-</i>	
<i>lip-</i> , 1h	<i>pari-</i> Co. II reach: <i>parā-rasa-/parā-</i>	
<i>mit-</i> , 1i	<i>gmata-</i>	
<i>šyav-</i> <i>pari-</i> Conj. I, 1bd2ah	<i>sa-</i> go off: <i>šyav-</i>	
<i>sa-</i> , 1h2ck3ac		
<i>upa-i-: lip-</i> , 1c	<i>šinnu-</i> present oneself	<i>ā-i- + patiš</i>
		<i>rasa-/para-ita-</i>

B. TEXT OF THE COMMUNICATION AS READ OUT

The title you see on the handout is not a dodge for my title as announced in the programme. One cannot illustrate concretely the earliest attested transition of Iranian literacy, without selecting a set of examples suitably coherent and contextually clear. The title of the handout declares, by insertion of an etymological hyphen, that the examples selected are verbs belonging to the semantic range of «to go», Latin *ire*. These verbs not only denoted nuances of «going». They actually themselves went, and they went «trans». The it-inerary of their trans-it led from spoken Persian to written Elamite, the native language of Anshan before that country was renamed Persis. Subsequently, by royal order, the itinerary was extended from written Elamite, via spoken Persian, to written Persian recorded phonetically. Both these transitions required skill in mental translation simultaneous with either listening, writing, reading, or speaking, but the skill required by the second transition was so exacting, that the literacy aimed at by it was soon abandoned, and Persian phonetic illiteracy received a fresh lease of life, that was to last for a full six centuries.

The skill, however, at work in the second transition, is on record, in the Achaemenian inscriptions. We are going to test this skill, as can only be done by taking account of the contexts of each of the verbs selected for the test. The first three sections of the handout, from No. 1a down to No. 3e, are therefore so organized, as to refresh your memory of the logical sequence, into which each verb falls within the Behistun narrative.

The bits of English translation are Kent's. This is not because I think them invariably right, but because Hallock usually felt bound to rely on them for the Elamograph. No blame attaches to either scholar, as Kent did not know that he was translating an Elamite text, and Hallock was told that *his* text was Persian, only *after* he had translated it.

No. 1a of the handout. Nidintu-Bel revolted in Babylon. Consequently, says Darius, No. 1b, «I went off to Babylon against that Nidintu-Bel». No. 1c: Darius manages to cross the Tigris and rout the opposing troops. He is now free, No. 1d, to continue his advance on Babylon. But a hitch intervenes. Darius, No. 1e, had not yet arrived at Babylon when, No. 1f, Nidintu-Bel came to deliver battle, this time on the Euphrates. Darius defeats him, No. 1g, whereupon, No. 1h, Nidintu-Bel fled to Babylon. No further hitch occurs to delay Darius, who now says for the third and last time, No. 1i, what he had said in Nos 1b and 1d. In those two numbers, however, the Elamite verb corresponding to Old Persian *šyav-*, was *pari-*; in No. 1i it is *mit-*.

You will have noticed that also in No. 1h no *pari-* occurs. There, El. *puttuka* renders OP *amuθa* «fled», while to OP *ašyava* two El. verbs correspond, *sa-* and *lip-*, of which the second appears also in No. 1e, where it corresponds to OP *upa-i-*. Casting a glance at the next, and final bit of the Nidintu-Bel episode, No. 1j, should one not infer from the fact that the rebel was captured *after* the seizure of the city, that in No. 1h Nidintu-Bel did not merely «go off» to Babylon, but was foolish enough to go right *into* Babylon? And that perhaps this is the reason why in No. 1h we find *lipka*, added to a *sak* which elsewhere often enough corresponds all by itself to OP *šyav-*, for instance in Nos 2c, 2k, 3a, 3c?

We pass on to section 2, the episode of Fravarti. He revolted in Media, and in Media the Median army, No. 2a, went over to him. To *ašyava* in No. 2a, there corresponds in the Elamograph the same verb *pari-* as in the 1st person appears in Nos. 1b and 1d. *Pariya*, and the *pariš* of No. 2a, belong both to Hallock's Conjugation One, which in clear cases conjugates transitive, active preterites.

As Darius was still fully engaged in Babylonia, he instructs his Persian lieutenant Vidarna to lead into Media Persian troops. He tells them, No. 2b, *para-i-ta*, adding the command I quote only in English, «Smite the rebel army!». Elamite *mit-*, for OP *para-i-*, is the same verb as in No. 1i we saw facing OP *šyav-*.

Electrified by Darius's *para-i-ta*, Vidarna duly «marched off», No. 2c, the Elamograph adds «to Media». Here we see OP *šyav-* represented by *sak* alone, and not also by *lipka* as was the case in No. 1h. Both *sak* and *lipka* belong, like the *parik* of No. 2d, to Hallock's Conjugation Two, which in clear cases conjugates intransitive and passive preterites.

Upon arrival in Media, No. 2d, Vidarna inflicts on the rebels, No. 2e, a preliminary defeat. He then took it easy, waiting, No. 2f, for Darius to arrive as soon as he gain control of Babylonia.

Darius did gain control, No. 2g, and departed from Babylon. Next he tells us, No. 2h, that *ašyavam Mādam*, with the effect that in No. 2i *Mādam parārasam*. The Elamograph has *pari-* in both 2h and 2i, in 2h in the transitive Conjugation One, in 2i in the intransitive and passive Conjugation Two, of which we saw the 3rd singular in No. 2d.

Kent gives four times «arrived», from No. 2d down to No. 2i. We can accept this for OP *rasa-* in No. 2f, and for *rasa-* with preverb *parā* in Nos 2d and 2i, but clearly in No. 2h we should have expected Kent to print «I went off», not only because he used «I went off» for OP *šyav-* in the parallel situation of No. 1d, but chiefly because the nuances of multivalent OP words can be monitored in the Elamograph. In the present instance the label *pariya* of *ašyavam* in both passages, suggests that whatever English translation is right for OP *šyav-* in 1d, will be right also in 2h, but not necessarily in 1h for example, or in 1i or 3c. Conversely, if «went off» is right in No. 3c for example, it may well be off the mark in Nos 1d and 2h.

At any rate such discrepancy deserves investigation, especially as it works both ways. Not only is OP *šyav-* elamographed by a variety of El. verbs, but for instance one and the same El. verb *šinnu-*, faces in No. 2f OP *rasa-*, but in No. 2j OP *ā-i-*, just as it did in No. 1f. The contextual situations of Nos 1f and 2j are parallel. In No. 1f it was Nidintu-Bel who «came», in order to join battle, be defeated in No. 1g, and flee in No. 1h. In No. 2j it is Fravarti who «came», in order to join battle with Darius as soon as he arrived in Media. Fravarti, too, is defeated, No. 2k, and flees, not of course to Babylon, but to the district Ragā of Media. The OP of No. 2k closely agrees with the OP of No. 1h, but in the Elamite column one looks in vain in No. 2k, for the verb *lip-* which in No. 1h we suspected, on the strength of No. 1j, of somehow conveying Nidintu-Bel's entry right into Babylon.

It is for the sake of the verb *lip-*, that we turn to section 3, concerned with §47 of the Behistun inscription. What happened to Fravarti after in No. 2k he fled to Ragā, is in any case too harassing for contemplation at an amiable symposium.

The subject of No. 3a, where again *sak* alone faces OP *ašyava*, is an anonymous rebel chieftain who, after a battle in which he was defeated by Vivāna, satrap of Arachosia, *amuθa*, *ašyava*, and, No. 3b, «went past», as Kent puts it, the fortress Aršādā, which was the residence, or one of the residences, of the satrap.

It so happens that in No. 3b *atiyāiš* is an Old Iranian hapax. Kent's translation is an adaptation to Bartholomae's, who for *avaparā* gave «dort davor», and for *atiyāiš* «er zog vorüber». By way of explanation Bartholomae offered the reconstruction I quote in No. 3e, of which the

last sentence is based on the inscriptional statements of Nos 3c and 3d. Bartholomae's reconstruction is too reasonable for me to want to dismiss it, but we must ask why Weissbach chose to ignore it, see No. 3b, Weissbach who translated No. 1h as if, like No. 2k, it contained no *lipka*, and who in No. 1e printed for *lipuketa* «ich war heran».

We must assume, since Weissbach offered no comment, that he disregarded Bartholomae's «vorüber», «vorbei» in Nos 3b and 3e, not because he was unaware that Vedic *ati-i-* has precisely the meaning «vorübergehen» which Bartholomae attributes to OP *ati-i-*, but because in No. 1e he rightly wanted the verb *lip-* to connote not «vorbei», but «heran», in conformity with the preverb *upa* of OP *upa-i-*, for which Persian verb, naturally, also Bartholomae in No. 1e, gives not «vorübergehen», but «gelangen nach». However, since in No. 1h Weissbach has «zog nach Babylon», with not even one word additional to his «zog nach Ragā» of No. 2k, it would seem that his policy in regard to the verb *lip-* was to disregard it altogether wherever possible, and where this was not possible, to hold it strictly in the leash of the «heran» which No. 1e inexorably demands.

No wonder that, torn between Bartholomae and Weissbach, Hallock in Chicago did not dare to offer more than «to come» for El. *lip-*. Here in Freiburg we had better give both German giants their due. Both of them knew *ati-i-* only as an Old Iranian hapax. They were not yet aware that in Sogdian, a Middle Iranian language that shares several isoglosses with Old Persian, as well as in Middle Persian itself, *ati-i-* has survived, in the shape of *tys-* and *'dyh-* respectively, and means not «vorübergehen», and not «herantreten» either, but exclusively «hineingehen, eintreten», as eminently suits, in view of No. 1j, the *lipka* of No. 1h.

The Middle Iranian verb, however, does not prove Bartholomae wrong. In Old Persian, *ati-i-* may have been used in both the Vedic and the Sogdian sense, its preverb *ati* comporting both «vorbei» and «hinein». In genuine Elamite, on the other hand, the connotation «hinein» of *lip-*, suggested for No. 1h by No. 1j, would be under standable as an extension, of the connotation «heran» required by No. 1e, unless, more simply, the basic meaning of *lip-* was «eintreffen», thereby rendering the Elamite verb employable for both «heran» and «hinein». To «vorbei», by contrast, a verb *lip-* that meant «eintreffen», would be as inapplicable as Weissbach wanted. If then Bartholomae's understanding of the OP of No. 3b be correct (though «dort davor» needs replacement, perhaps with «thereabouts»), then *lipka*, there, stands not as a translation of OP *atīyāiš*, but merely as a symbol for the sound of the word *atīyāiš*, a sound by which Darius

intended to convey «er ging vorüber», but which his scribe, by homonymy, took to mean «er traf ein».

A nut even tougher at first sight, is the use of the Elamite label *mit-*, for OP *šyav-* in No. 1i, but for OP *para-i-* in No. 2b, when yet in No. 4c OP *para-i-* is labelled *šinnu-*, and El. *šinnu-* in its turn is used also for OP *ā-i-* in Nos 1f and 2j on the one hand, and for OP *rasa-* in No. 2f on the other. What was the matter with Elamite, unless you prefer to word the same question as «what is it that went wrong with Old Persian»?

The importance of context is never to be lost sight of. Context gives us a pretty shrewd idea as to what *mit-* might signify in No. 2b. If one adds this experience of *mit-* to the guidance which context provides from No. 1a down to No. 1i, then in No. 1i Kent's «I went to Babylon» comes to look rather less than adequate. Darius, as soon as Nidintu-Bel no longer stood in his way, went ahead-towards, advanced-upon, Babylon. This sense of El. *mit-* suits also the Sacas beyond Sogdiane, and the Sacas beyond the Sea, of Nos 4a and 4b. The two Saca countries lay ahead, viewed from Susa, of Sogdiane and the Sea respectively.

But if so, why is it that we find *šinnu-* for OP *para-i-* in No. 4c, and not *mit-* as we do in No. 2b?

The first point to heed, is that the OP of No. 2b offers a present-stem of a verb, while the OP of No. 4c offers a past participle. Both contain the root *i-* «to go» of Latin *ire*, and the preverb looks the same in both. Accordingly, all handbooks treat the two forms as belonging to one and the same Persian verb. However, Iranian present-stems and past participles, especially of verbs for «to come» and «to go», were inordinately fond of cross-wedlocks, so-called suppletive coalitions. Was the past participle of No. 4c, really married to the present-stem of No. 2b? Its Elamite label suggests that its present-stem partner was not the *para-i-* of No. 2b, but the *rasa-* of No. 2f.

This would actually not be surprising, seeing that the same *rasa-*, when equipped with the preverb *parā* as it is in Nos 2d and 2i, had secured for itself a past participle outside etymological wedlock. We learn this from the fact, that *parārasa-*'s El. label in No. 2d, Conjugation Two of the verb *pari-*, serves also as label of *parāgmātā* in No. 4d. In the suppletive coalition *parārasa-: parāgmātā-*, No. 5a, the past participle belongs to the root *gam-* «to come», as it does in the suppletive coalition of No. 5b familiar to you all from Modern Persian *āyad: āmad*. In No. 5b, however, the past participle of *gam-* is suppletively paired not with *rasa-*, as it is in No. 5a, but with a present-stem of the root *i-*.

This is why one might almost *expect* the present stem *para-i-* of No. 2*b* to be paired, not as the handbooks insists, with the past participle *para-ita-* of No. 4*c*, but with an asterisked **para-gmata-* as you see it in No. 5*c*, so that of Nos 5*b* and 5*c*, it might be said that they *transeunt pari passu*.

The translation offered in No. 5*c*, however, is one for which I have not yet prepared you, any more than I have as yet said everything that needs to be said in justification of No. 5*d*, my final item.

In considering El. *šinnu-*, one is struck by the fact that the Elamograph of No. 1*f* reproduces the Old Persian phrase *patiš mān*, but the Elamograph of No. 2*j* ignores it. It would therefore be rash to conclude from No. 1*f*, that the Elamogram of *rasa-* «to arrive», No. 2*f*, served also for OP *ā-i-* «to come». For, No. 2*j* suggests that the meaning of OP *patiš* is *included* in the genuine, native Elamite meaning of *šinnu-*, and therefore the Elamogram of Persian *ā-i-* by itself, unattested in so-called bilingual inscriptions, is unlikely to have been *šinnu-*. On the other hand, if in *šinnu-* the meanings of both, *patiš* and *ā-i-*, are present, then its employment also as Elamogram of *rasa-* in No. 2*f*, virtually excludes that *patiš* had in Old Persian the same meaning as OP *abi* has in No. 1*b*. Weissbach's «entgegen» for *patiš* in No. 1*f* was better than Kent's «against», but we are by now driven by the sum total of *šinnu*-equations to conclude, without objections arising from etymological considerations, that the true meaning of *patiš* was «face to face».

Elamite *šinnu-* will accordingly have meant «to come face to face, to present oneself». This is a different form of «arrival» from that which, say, German *ankommen* conveys, but it enables us to realize that, the preverb *para* in No. 2*b* literally has the meaning of German *vor*aus, inasmuch as it combines the sense of Vedic *purā* «vor» with the sense of Vedic *parā* «weg». In No. 4*c*, by contrast, where collation with Nos 2*f* and 2*j* reveals that the true meaning is «they presented themselves to NN», the preverb *para* means no more than «vor», the «vor» of German *es kommt vor*, which phrase is in French *il arrive*. Thus Elamite, and German and French, suffice to close the Persian circle which, opened up horizontally, you see outlined in No. 5*d*.

I have finished, because I asked for, and was granted, twenty-five minutes, not fifty. Had they been fifty, I should now be turning to the big questions which, instead, I hope to have provided an incentive for *you* to raise, for instance the question as to why the Elamograph at times conveys circumstances with greater precision than the phonetically written Persian version, when yet no one knew the circumstances more precisely than the *Persian* king who throughout the inscription, declares himself its author. In a nutshell, however, the lesson to be

learned from the present exercise in trans-ition, can be summed up in words paraphrasing a famous proverb. The five fingers of one hand wash the five of the other, but it takes all ten to clear the face.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Christian BARTHOLOMAE, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg, 1904.
 George G. CAMERON, «The Elamite version of the Bisitun Inscriptions», *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*, XIV, 1960, 62-68.
 Ilya GERSHEVITCH, «The Alloclottography of Old Persian», *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1979, 114-190.
 Richard T. HALLOCK, «The Finite Verb in Achaemenid Elamite», *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, XVIII, 1959, 1-19.
 The same, «The Verbal Nouns in Achaemenid Elamite», *Studia B. Landsberger*, Chicago, 1965, 121-125.
 The same, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets*, Chicago, 1969.
 Helmut HUMBACH, «Altpersisch *avaparā* *otiyāiš*», *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 45, 1985, 97-103. [Not yet available at the time of writing. Rather than with Greek *para*, as Humbach proposes, I should link *avaparā* with the Vedic *parā* «weg, out» quoted above, and translate it «thereabouts». One then understands why in No. 3*b* above El. *hami* corresponds to it, which elsewhere regularly elamographs OP *avodā* «there»].
 Roland G. KENT, *Old Persian*, New Haven, 1950.
 Herbert H. PAPER, *The Phonology and Morphology of Royal Achaemenid Elamite*, Ann Arbor, 1955.
 F.H. WEISSBACH, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*, Leipzig, 1911.